

**CERTIFIED ACCESS SPECIALIST PROGRAM**  
**IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

Division of the State Architect

**Minutes of Public Meeting**  
**Tuesday, September 14, 2004**

1102 Q Street, 5th Floor, Conference Room B  
Sacramento, California

**Committee Members Present**

Robyn Dahlgren, Facilitator  
James Abrams  
Regina Brown  
Jürgen Dostert  
Pete Guisasola  
Daniel P. Larsen  
John Lonberg  
Michael Paravagna  
Philip C. Rubin  
Patricia Yeager

**DSA Staff Present**

Mary Ann Aguayo  
Richard Conrad  
Rod Higgins  
Karen Hodgkins  
Michael Mankin  
Andreas P. Michael  
Terry Salo  
Elizabeth Schroeder  
Mark Smith  
Elena Tarailo

**Committee Members Absent**

Patricia Barbosa  
Yolanda Benson  
Gene Lozano

**Others Present**

Susan Barnhill (via telephone)  
James V. Vitale, PBWS Architects

1 **Call to Order and Introductions**

2 Ms. Robyn Dahlgren called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. She introduced and  
3 welcomed Ms. Regina Brown, Office of the Attorney General, replacing Ms. Suzy  
4 Ambrose.

5

6 Ms. Dahlgren suggested taking staff presentations first, followed by comments from  
7 committee members, and then public comments.

8

9 **Project Status Report**

10 Mr. Rod Higgins noted the committee previously reviewed the overall scope and  
11 professional roles of certified access specialists, established certification criteria, and  
12 began defining professional standards. He said the committee will be working on

1 finalizing the professional standards at this meeting, and then moving on to address the  
2 exam and exam components. Future plans include developing a training program,  
3 determining training format and delivery, implementing quality control through ongoing  
4 monitoring of specialists' performance, resolving program governance issues, and  
5 developing a recertification process.

#### 6 7 **Minutes of July 13, 2004 Meeting**

8 Ms. Dahlgren welcomed comments on the minutes of the committee's July 13 meeting.  
9 Committee members made no corrections or comments.

10  
11 Ms. Karen Hodgkins asked members of the public wishing to make comments to fill out  
12 the forms available from the staff at the back of the room. She distributed updated  
13 committee rosters and noted the changes were the addition of Ms. Brown's name and a  
14 new email address for Mr. Jürgen Dostert.

#### 15 16 **Report on the August Special Workgroup Session**

17 Mr. Dostert said that Ms. Susan Barnhill took notes at the work group's meeting in  
18 August. He reported that the group spent most of the day discussing educational and  
19 professional experience requirements. There was general consensus that candidates  
20 should have at least a high school education or GED, plus either one year of college-  
21 level coursework in a related field and two years of experience or four years of  
22 experience. In addition, all candidates must successfully complete the training program  
23 and demonstrate competency in knowledge of building codes.

24  
25 Mr. Dostert said Mr. Gene Lozano felt that one of the classifications needed to have at  
26 least one year of technical writing experience as well.

1

2 Mr. Dostert offered to provide the staff with copies of Ms. Barnhill's notes and his email  
3 summary of the meeting.

4

5 Ms. Hodgkins reported that committee members in attendance were Mr. John Lonberg,  
6 Ms. Patricia Yeager, Ms. Brown, Mr. Dostert, Mr. Lozano, and Mr. Abrams.

7

8 Ms. Hodgkins noted Mr. Lozano and Ms. Sharon Toji developed a proposal for an  
9 access signage specialist certification. She said she told them the committee was trying  
10 to get away from specialization, but both felt strongly that a special certification was  
11 needed in the area of signage. She distributed the materials and recommended that the  
12 committee discuss their proposal. Ms. Dahlgren suggested that committee members  
13 review the proposal over the lunch break.

14

15 **Revised Certification Classifications (Staff Report 3.1)**

16 Mr. Mark Smith announced that DSA has decided to move from three certification  
17 classifications to two classifications, and four general principles have emerged: 1)  
18 There should be a minimal number of certification classifications; 2) The licensed  
19 architect should be the primary focus for certification; 3) A second specialist  
20 classification should be established for conducting investigations; and 4) The  
21 fundamental distinction between the two classifications is based on which group should  
22 provide design services for accessibility.

23

24 Mr. Smith displayed a chart showing the distinctions, professional roles, limitations,  
25 educational qualifications, and experience qualifications for the two classifications of

1 Access Compliance Investigator and Access Design Specialist. He reviewed the entries  
2 in the chart and welcomed comments.  
3  
4 Mr. Lonberg questioned the experience qualifications proposed for the Access  
5 Compliance Investigator classification. He noted the descriptions may be too narrow  
6 because there may be other ways of gaining experience in code enforcement.  
7  
8 Mr. Michael Mankin observed that the investigator also needs to be able to  
9 communicate effectively in architectural terms. He expressed his opinion that the  
10 investigative role needs to be very prescriptive and very ministerial to preserve the  
11 integrity and independence of the position and to prevent architects from trying to  
12 transfer liability to the investigators.  
13  
14 Mr. Smith noted the certified access specialists will be required to provide copies of all  
15 reports and surveys to DSA headquarters, and that process will help prevent abuses.  
16  
17 Mr. Dostert suggested deleting the word “including” from the description of the  
18 investigator’s professional roles. Other committee members agreed.  
19  
20 Mr. Dostert recommended changing the experience section to recognize various types  
21 of professional experience.  
22  
23 Ms. Brown expressed reservations about the “Access Compliance Investigator” title  
24 because of enforcement connotation. She proposed “Access Compliance Specialist”  
25 instead. Ms. Dahlgren suggested taking a straw poll at the end of the meeting to  
26 determine what title the majority of committee members preferred.

1

2 Mr. Lonberg drew attention to the “Limits to Services” entry on the chart and questioned  
3 whether the investigator should be allowed to identify solutions. Mr. Dostert said he  
4 believed the investigator should provide proposed solutions. Mr. Pete Guisasola  
5 agreed.

6

7 Mr. Smith noted it could be impractical and inefficient to expect the access specialists to  
8 be providing DSA with copies of all their reports. Committee members decided to  
9 discuss oversight and report formats at the next meeting.

10

11 Mr. Philip Rubin, through a sign language interpreter, questioned whether access  
12 design specialists should be required to be licensed architects. Mr. Mankin expressed  
13 his opinion that unlicensed people with experience should work under the supervision of  
14 a licensed architect. Mr. Smith noted that even after the certification program is  
15 implemented, there will still be some experts who are not certified. However,  
16 certification will eventually offer an economic advantage to architects who obtain it.

17

18 Mr. Dostert spoke in favor of requiring licensure for access design specialists.

19

20 Mr. Dan Larsen noted that limiting the classification to licensed architects may  
21 discourage people from using certified access specialists, especially if the certification  
22 program is voluntary. He expressed concern about forcing business owners to hire  
23 additional people. He recommended making the program as broad and inclusive as  
24 possible. Mr. Mankin pointed out that architects who offer the additional certification will  
25 have a marketing edge, so the availability of certification can function as an incentive.

26

1 Mr. Abrams applauded DSA for developing a program to assist building owners in  
2 identifying people with expertise and qualifications in the area of accessibility. He noted  
3 uncertified people will still be able to practice, but the marketplace will eventually drive  
4 building owners toward certified people. He likened the situation to lawyers or doctors  
5 who specialize in certain areas of practice. Mr. Abrams expressed his opinion that the  
6 exam, the educational qualifications, and the experience qualifications need to be very  
7 rigorous.

8

9 Mr. Abrams spoke in favor of future legislation giving legal recourse and extra protection  
10 to building owners who hire certified specialists. He pointed out that such legislation  
11 would provide an additional incentive to use certified specialists. He added that the  
12 insurance industry might eventually provide premium discounts for building owners who  
13 hire certified specialists. Mr. Abrams said another goal for the future should be a quality  
14 control system to track complaints.

15

16 Mr. Abrams expressed his opinion that access compliance investigators should not be  
17 limited to providing design resources, but should be able to help solve problems as well.

18

19 Ms. Brown again recommended changing the title of the Access Compliance  
20 Investigator to "Access Compliance Specialist." She asked if people like Mr. Lonberg,  
21 with considerable experience and expertise in the field, would fit the proposed  
22 requirements for that category.

23

24 Mr. Mankin cautioned that creating the Access Compliance Investigator could result in  
25 architects attempting to shift liability to the certified specialist. He agreed with Mr.  
26 Abrams that building owners should have some incentive to hire certified people, but he

1 emphasized that the role of the investigator does not usurp the responsibilities of the  
2 architect or building owner.

3

4 Ms. Yeager emphasized the need to utilize transition plans to facilitate the birth of the  
5 new access specialist program. She expressed concern about the notion that certifying  
6 that a building has proper access will protect building owners from liability. She added  
7 that access involves more than just building features alone. Ms. Yeager noted that  
8 having a transition plan in place is more likely to protect someone from a lawsuit than  
9 shifting responsibility.

10

11 Mr. Mankin noted the next meeting agenda will include the topics of training and  
12 development of transition plans. He agreed that any kind of approval is merely a  
13 snapshot of a building at a given point in time, and building owners still need to be  
14 informed of the resources the state offers.

15

16 Ms. Dahlgren invited comments from members of the public.

17

18 Mr. Jim Vitale recommended simplifying the educational qualifications for the Access  
19 Design Specialist by eliminating the language about a five-year degree. He noted  
20 California is one of a few states that allow people to become architects without going  
21 through a formal college degree program.

22

23 Mr. Vitale commented that there are already some certification programs offered for  
24 architects, and he cited LEED certification as an example. He said his office has found  
25 that clients are demanding LEED certification, and the same thing will probably happen

1 eventually with access specialists. Mr. Vitale added that if there are enough financial  
2 incentives, building owners will hire access consultants.

3

4 Mr. Vitale suggested changing the title of the Access Compliance Investigator to  
5 "Access Compliance Consultant."

6

7 Mr. Vitale noted building officials lack the authority to modify or interpret the Americans  
8 with Disabilities Act (ADA). Under the law, he said, the only people who are able to  
9 raise claims are people with disabilities.

10

11 Mr. Rubin noted barriers need to be removed from existing buildings as well as new  
12 buildings, and he questioned how the certified access specialist program would apply to  
13 older buildings. Mr. Abrams said California building owners are liable for any violations  
14 of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, so even older buildings need to be made accessible.

15

16 Mr. Mankin commented that an investigation of an existing building would actually be an  
17 architectural snapshot of the building, absent the programming side of access. He said  
18 a certified specialist would be able to advise the building owner on a whole range of  
19 access issues, including readily achievable barrier removal, job accommodation for  
20 disabled employees, mitigation plans, and funding resources.

21

22 Ms. Brown asked if there would be any grandfathering to allow current people in the  
23 field to become certified, even if they do not meet all the qualifications. Mr. Mankin  
24 responded that he and Mr. Smith have been discussing the issue of grandfathering. He  
25 noted most certification programs provide some grandfathering mechanism, but a  
26 separate set of qualifications and standards will need to be developed. He said all



1 candidates would need to pass the exam, but there might be some flexibility in meeting  
2 the eligibility requirements.

3

4 At 11:50 a.m., the committee recessed for lunch. Ms. Dahlgren reconvened the  
5 meeting at 12:20 p.m.

6

7 Ms. Dahlgren proposed taking a straw poll on changing the title of the Access  
8 Compliance Investigator. She noted there were three alternatives: "Access  
9 Compliance Investigator," "Access Compliance Specialist," and "Access Compliance  
10 Consultant."

11

12 Mr. Mankin commented that use of the word "specialist" might be confusing because  
13 "specialist" is also in the title of the other classification. He noted people might have a  
14 tendency to refer to both classifications as "access specialist" without making any  
15 distinction between them.

16

17 Ms. Dahlgren asked committee members to indicate their preference for one of the  
18 three titles. Four committee members voted for "Investigator," one voted for  
19 "Specialist," and four voted for "Consultant." Ms. Dahlgren proposed referring this issue  
20 to the State Architect, along with a summary of the committee's discussion.

21

22 Ms. Dahlgren recommended taking another straw vote on whether Access Compliance  
23 Investigators should be allowed to propose design solutions as well as design  
24 resources, as described in the "Limits to Services" section on the chart. Committee  
25 members unanimously voted in favor of including design services.

26

1 Committee members agreed to delete the word “including” from the language under  
2 “Professional Roles.”

3

4 Ms. Hodgkins proposed changing the wording to say, “May provide design resources  
5 and specific solutions.”

6

7 Mr. Smith asked the committee for guidance as to the experience qualifications for  
8 Access Compliance Investigators.

9

10 Ms. Dahlgren noted that Ms. Barnhill had joined the meeting by teleconference.

11

12 After some discussion, the committee decided to change the wording in that section to  
13 say, “Two years of employment with duties involving access compliance,” and omit the  
14 alternative of additional education.

15

16 Mr. Guisasola recommended inserting the word “Certified” before the title of both  
17 classifications. Other committee members agreed.

18

19 The committee discussed the educational qualifications for Access Design Specialists.

20 Mr. Dostert noted Mr. Lozano wanted to include some technical writing coursework, but  
21 other committee members did not necessary agree. He suggested an acceptable  
22 compromise might be to work that into the exam somehow. Committee members  
23 decided to consider this option during the discussion on exam contents.

24

1 After some discussion, the committee decided to change the wording of the educational  
2 qualifications section for Access Design Specialists to read, "As allowed for architectural  
3 licensing."

4  
5 Mr. Abrams apologized for having to leave early. He noted the Hotel and Lodging  
6 Association created a training video for hotel and restaurant employees, and a separate  
7 one for law enforcement people, dealing with service animals and people with  
8 disabilities. He asked for time at a future meeting to show the tapes to the committee.

9  
10 Mr. Rubin and Ms. Barnhill offered to provide input on hearing dogs.

11  
12 **Article I. General Examination Concepts (Staff Report 4.1)**

13 Mr. Smith showed a graphic illustrating the kinds of coursework and training available in  
14 the DSA Academy for certified access specialist. Using an academic model, he noted  
15 DSA proposes to offer two "degrees," one for Access Compliance Investigators and one  
16 for Access Design Specialists. Mr. Smith said introductory courses for both degrees  
17 would include accessibility codes and field investigations of accessibility. As  
18 prerequisites for advanced courses, candidates would need some basic familiarity with  
19 blueprint reading and plan review and approval. Students in both degree programs  
20 would study drafting accessible features, which would include drafting consistency,  
21 dimension, specifications, document coordination, and reviewing for accessibility.  
22 Access Design Specialists would also study accessibility design issues.

23  
24 Mr. Smith said DSA is basing exam composition and training courses on three  
25 principles: 1) The discipline of disability access has a common body of knowledge,  
26 such as terminology and reference standards, to which stakeholders and other

1 participants in this field refer; 2) The examination should differ between classifications to  
2 reflect the professional roles and areas of responsibility for each; and 3) Candidates  
3 must achieve a passing score on each test section one time only to demonstrate lifetime  
4 competency in a particular subject area. He noted that once candidates pass a  
5 particular section, they will not have to go back and be retested on that material.

6  
7 Ms. Brown asked how long the courses will be. Mr. Smith said the length of each  
8 training course has not yet been determined.

9  
10 Mr. Higgins added that course duration will depend on who is being trained and their  
11 level of experience. He said DSA is currently planning an eight-day course for one  
12 particular audience.

13  
14 Ms. Brown asked if the test questions will be multiple-choice. She recommended giving  
15 a final exam for each course in addition to the certification exam itself. She noted  
16 having to be tested on the same material twice helps reinforce the knowledge. Ms.  
17 Brown advocated a cumulative approach rather than a one-time exam.

18  
19 Mr. Higgins said people may need to go back for remedial instruction in certain areas as  
20 part of the recertification process.

21  
22 **Organization of the Certification Examination (Staff Report 4.1)**

23 Mr. Smith noted the knowledge from each course would be tested in the certification  
24 examination.

1 Mr. Rubin asked about the timeframe for passing the entire exam. He noted AIA allows  
2 seven years to pass all nine parts of the exam, and he suggested a two- or four-year  
3 time might be reasonable for the certified access specialist exam.

4

5 Mr. Rubin also asked whether there will be any sensitivity training as part of the  
6 curriculum. He pointed out that taking a written test is one thing, but dealing with  
7 someone who is blind, deaf, or in a wheelchair takes other skills. He recommended  
8 recognizing this need in the curriculum. Mr. Smith stated that sensitivity training will be  
9 included.

10

11 Mr. Smith noted both discipline knowledge and professional practice areas will be part  
12 of the exam. He displayed a chart showing the areas to be covered under the topics of:  
13 a) accessibility codes and standards, b) standard methods of field investigation, c)  
14 review of accessible features in construction documents, and d) design methods for  
15 accessible facilities and their programmed use. Mr. Smith said the exact number of  
16 questions and specific wording will be guided by psychometricians.

17

18 Mr. Larsen noted people who do plan review will be more familiar with construction  
19 documents than candidates who provide more general consulting advice. Mr. Smith  
20 said the training courses will teach people how to recognize accessible elements on  
21 building plans.

22

23 Mr. Vitale noted ADA specialists have to be able to read complete sets of drawings and  
24 specifications, including fire life safety, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical drawings.

25

1 Ms. Brown pointed out the distinction between licensure and certification. She noted  
2 licensure candidates have to be able to pass an overall exam, while knowledge of each  
3 individual component is more important for certification candidates.

4

5 Mr. Dostert recommended including plan review training in the curriculum for Access  
6 Compliance Investigators. Mr. Smith said the intent is to ensure that the both exams  
7 test on basic knowledge of codes and standards, field observation, review of  
8 construction documents, and some technical writing. In addition, Access Design  
9 Specialists will be responsible to know more about architectural design and resolving  
10 conflicts.

11

12 Mr. Dostert noted Access Compliance Investigators also need training on some of the  
13 design concepts. He noted interpreting codes, strategic planning, and providing advice  
14 on resolving problems should be part of their expertise.

15

16 Mr. Guisasola commented that the last two boxes on the right of the chart, related to  
17 professional practices, are critical to ensuring proper access compliance.

18

19 Ms. Yeager supported the idea of training everyone to use the same guidelines so the  
20 rules can be applied consistently on a nationwide basis.

21

22 Mr. Vitale praised committee members and staff for their efforts. He noted California  
23 will be setting a national precedent in establishing this certification program.

24

25 **Contents of Examination Components (Staff Report 3.3)**

1 Mr. Smith distributed a chart showing the proposed content areas of the exams and how  
2 they relate to specific areas of responsibility and expected duties.

3

4 For the exam component, “accessibility codes and standards”, Mr. Smith reviewed the  
5 scope of knowledge regarding accessibility codes, standards, and design resources;  
6 and the ability to verify the scope of applicable codes and standards. He distributed a  
7 handout listing the chapters and topics covered in the DSA/AC Guidelines. Mr. Smith  
8 also displayed a summary of the statutory references for each topic.

9

10 Ms. Brown recommended that every candidate be responsible for learning about the  
11 impacts of disabling conditions.

12

13 Mr. Mankin said DSA could draw on some existing training programs for occupational  
14 therapists and people in the medical field. He recommended contacting representatives  
15 of each disability group to make sure the training materials and exam reflect their  
16 primary needs and concerns. Mr. Mankin added that DSA is more interested in an  
17 advocacy perspective than a medical perspective. Mr. Rubin noted the access  
18 specialists should know how to contact the disability groups for their feedback whenever  
19 necessary.

20

21 Mr. Rubin asked if it will be possible for people to take the training courses online. Mr.  
22 Mankin responded that DSA looked into this possibility but concluded that interaction is  
23 a key to successful learning and retention of knowledge, at least for people who are  
24 being exposed to the materials for the first time. He noted online courses might be  
25 appropriate for people with more advanced knowledge or experience in the area. Mr.

1 Smith commented that research on distance learning suggests that a combination of  
2 interactive learning and online study may be the most effective way for people to learn.  
3

4 Mr. Rubin asked how sensitivity training will be delivered. Mr. Mankin said the  
5 legislation makes it clear that sensitivity is an essential part of what consultants and  
6 designers need to know. He emphasized the importance of self-awareness in practicing  
7 access compliance and teaching a code of ethics. He said key components of the  
8 training methodology should be goals based on accepted principles, performance  
9 standards, prescriptive requirements, and management of subjective issues.  
10

11 Mr. Larsen asked which accessibility codes and standards will comprise the basic  
12 documents on which candidates will be tested. He noted the three basic codes  
13 applicable in this area are Title 24 of the California Building Code, ADAAG, and ANSI  
14 standards, and then there are reference manuals that provide interpretations and rules  
15 of design, and there are differences among them that have yet to be resolved. Mr.  
16 Mankin said DSA currently uses a specific checklist that includes all clearly applicable  
17 codes. He noted the checklist does not include matters of conjecture or risk  
18 management issues, which are unenforceable; however, these performance obligations  
19 are mandated in statutory law. Mr. Mankin added that applicable codes are determined  
20 on a project-by-project basis, depending on occupancy, funding sources, use, and  
21 ownership.  
22

23 Mr. Guisasola observed that it would be helpful for DSA to publish a resource list,  
24 especially for designers.  
25



1 Mr. Smith suggested revising exam content so that sensitivity training is incorporated in  
2 the accessibility codes and standards exam component.  
3  
4 Mr. Smith next discussed the proposed exam component for “methods of field  
5 observation”, including: a) observing and recording field conditions; b) use of approved  
6 survey documents; c) program reporting requirements and d) preparing verified reports.  
7 He noted Government Code Section 4452 states that once building owners are aware  
8 of specific deficiencies, they have 90 days to correct the problems before they incur  
9 penalties. He recommended that all reports prepared by access specialists should have  
10 a section informing parties of their legal obligations to correct deficiencies.  
11  
12 Committee members questioned who would make determinations as to which  
13 deficiencies constituted violations and what responsibilities certified specialists should  
14 have in terms of reporting problems.  
15  
16 Mr. Dostert pointed out that these determinations can be complicated because the  
17 codes changed at different points in history, so the existence of a violation depends on  
18 the year a building was constructed. Mr. Mankin observed that certified access  
19 specialists would have to have separate punch lists for every code year, which would be  
20 very cumbersome and difficult to administer. Mr. Smith noted that although this is a  
21 difficult issue, it is a worthy one. An important goal of the certification program is to  
22 prevent different interpretations by specialists.  
23  
24 After some discussion, committee members agreed that access specialists need to  
25 know the basic method of historical code analysis. They recommended that DSA make  
26 resources available so specialists can evaluate buildings according to the codes

1 applicable at the time the buildings were built. In terms of describing the knowledge  
2 base to be tested, Mr. Smith suggested requiring applications to “determine applicable  
3 codes and standards that correspond to the time of construction of the area under  
4 investigation.” Committee members agreed that both classifications of specialist should  
5 be tested in their abilities to decipher access history.

6

7 Mr. Lonberg emphasized the distinction between the building code, regulations and  
8 statutes. He noted the overarching statute, Government Code Section 4450, enacted in  
9 1968, simply says everything built with public funding must be “accessible to” and  
10 “usable by” everyone. Mr. Lonberg pointed out that although the statute does not  
11 change, codes and regulations change periodically to provide a clearer understanding of  
12 what is meant by “accessible to” and “usable by.” He emphasized that Government  
13 Code Section 4450 is not specifically tied to Title 24.

14

15 Mr. Mankin added that ANSI 117.1 was an interim standard until 1981, and since ANSI  
16 117.1 had no scoping provisions, this standard applied to all construction. However,  
17 when regulations were adopted in 1981, people began applying the standard to a  
18 certain percentage of rooms, rather than entire structures.

19

20 Mr. Mankin questioned whether the certified access specialist program should attempt  
21 to provide an expert level of investigatory capability, at least initially. He suggested it  
22 might be more reasonable to establish a certain acceptable caliber of accuracy and  
23 knowledge for the early years of the program. Then, as the program evolves and  
24 grows, it might be possible to address more complicated risk management and liability  
25 issues.

26

1 Mr. Dostert said his clients are only interested in knowing if their buildings were built in  
2 compliance with the codes applicable at the time they were constructed. He  
3 recommended that certified access specialists be tested in their abilities to find out what  
4 rules were applicable at specific time periods in the past.

5

6 Mr. Lonberg emphasized the importance of good record-keeping to determine the dates  
7 and codes in effect when a building was constructed.

8

9 Ms. Dahlgren observed that there seemed to be consensus among committee members  
10 that two key components are: understanding the process and history and understanding  
11 where to find information.

12

13 Mr. Guisasola said building officials often also have to conduct research to determine  
14 which versions of other codes were in effect at a given time. He commented that this  
15 information is available, so it might not be difficult to provide training of this kind.

16

17 Mr. Mankin pointed out that there is huge liability for being wrong. He recommended  
18 looking into this issue in more detail. Ms. Dahlgren proposed discussing this topic again  
19 at the next meeting.

20

21 Mr. Guisasola suggested that DSA compile information on access history between 1968  
22 and the present. Mr. Dostert noted the process could be complicated because  
23 individual cities adopted access requirements at different times than the state.

24

25 Mr. Smith said the language of Government Code Section 4450 confusingly refers to  
26 three different standards, including the outdated UBC. Mr. Mankin observed that in

1 looking at old codes, the only enforceable provisions are those that are clear; he  
2 estimated that about two-thirds of codes provisions are subjective or conjectural.

3

4 Mr. Smith next reviewed the contents of the proposed exam component on “drafting and  
5 review of accessible features in construction documents”, including a) required depiction  
6 of accessible elements; b) design of accessible elements involving finish grade  
7 changes; and c) coordination of accessible information in construction documents.

8

9 Mr. Smith said that in the exam component for “design methods of accessible facilities  
10 and their programmed use”, Access Design Specialists will be tested in a) design  
11 principles based on architectural impacts of disabling conditions; b) accessibility  
12 requirements of special occupancies and project types; c) strategies to resolve design  
13 problems arising from prescriptive requirements; and d) methods to demonstrate  
14 compliance with performance obligations.

15

16 Mr. Smith noted Chapter 17 of the California Building Codes allows building officials to  
17 require a statement of design intent as a form of special inspection for unusual projects.

18 Mr. Guisasola expressed support for giving local jurisdictions the ability to apply a  
19 special inspection concept for complex projects. He observed that having to articulate a  
20 design intent often improves clarity and continuity throughout the design process.

21

22 Mr. Dostert questioned the need to assign the responsibility for creating transition plans  
23 to licensed architects. After some discussion of the architect’s role, the committee  
24 proposed that exam questions on transition and mitigation plans be moved to the  
25 accessibility codes and standards section for all certification candidates. Mr. Michael

1 Paravagna emphasized the importance of obtaining input from people with disabilities  
2 while developing appropriate transition plans.

3

4 Mr. Vitale noted reports from certified access specialists should include disclaimers  
5 advising building owners they have 90 days to correct deficiencies. Similarly, he said,  
6 field investigators should disclose that they are observers and recorders of found facts,  
7 but they are not licensed code inspectors.

8

9 **Wrap Up/Adjournment**

10 Ms. Dahlgren thanked committee members for their participation. She said the staff will  
11 take all the comments under advisement and come back with revised proposals at the  
12 next meeting.

13

14 Ms. Dahlgren announced that the next committee meeting is scheduled for November 9,  
15 2004.

16

17 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.